



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,403	03/26/2004	Donald Edward Putzig	CH2973	1351

23906 7590 04/01/2005

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128
4417 LANCASTER PIKE
WILMINGTON, DE 19805

EXAMINER

BROWN, JENNINE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,403

Applicant(s)

PUTZIG, DONALD EDWARD

Examiner

Jennine M. Brown

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 18-32, 35-45 and 48-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 17, 33, 34, 46 and 47 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 3/26/04 was considered by the examiner.

Claims Analysis

Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). Examiner is treating claims 20-50 as product by process claims. Applicant should provide a showing as to the differences between the polyester produced in the instant claims and that of the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1755

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-15, 18-32, 35-45, 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jeon, et al. (US 6342579 B2) in view of Kakizawa (US 5844066 A).

See entire document. Jeon, et al. disclose a polyester resin and method of producing said resin by polycondensation in the presence of a titanium based compound as a catalyst and carboxy phosphonic acid type compound stabilizer to yield a polyester resin copolymerized with 1,4-cyclohexanedimethanol (col. 1, l. 41-47). Titanium based catalyst include tetraethyl titanate (col. 2, l. 55-col. 3, l. 6). Stabilizer used in the polycondensation are exemplified by formula I which meets the limitations of the primary claims (no free P-OH group) when R is not equal to hydrogen but selected from the rest of the Markush group (col. 3, l. 7-33). Although Jeon, et al. do not disclose the hydroxycarboxylic acid, alkanolamine or aminocarboxylic acid complexing agents, Kakizawa disclose a process for the preparation of lactic acid based polyester, disclose that phosphorus groups (with free P-OH) have previously been used to prevent the resultant polylactic acid from being colored and state that the acids are disadvantageous because they are hygroscopic and hydrolysable (col. 2, l. 23-41) and organic chelating agents such as hydroxycarboxylic acid, alkanolamine or aminocarboxylic acid complexing agents can successfully be used (col. 3, l. 46-col. 4, l. 67), thus curing the deficiency of Jeon, et al. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 1755

ordinary skill in the art to combine the catalytic benefits of a phosphorus compound having no free P-OH, with the added benefits of the organic chelating agents in providing a clear polyester resin material because a easily moldable, color stable material is preferable in industrial applications.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-17, 33-34 and 46-47 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Although prior art of record discloses aluminum, cobalt, zirconium or zinc compounds as primary catalysts for polyester polymerization, the prior art fails to fairly teach or disclose an alkyl titanate catalyst with a cocatalytic composition comprising an aluminum, cobalt, zirconium or zinc compound or combinations thereof, more specifically, zinc acetate, zinc chloride, zinc nitrate, zinc sulfate or combinations of two or more thereof.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennine M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-1364. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 9:30 AM - 7:30 PM; Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1755

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jmb



J.A. LORENGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER